

**ON TABLE ITEM**

Date: December 17, 2018  
Meeting: PUBLIC HEARING  
Item: 5

Schedule 91 to the Minutes of the Public Hearing meeting of Richmond City Council held on Monday, December 17, 2018.

**MayorandCouncillors**

**From:** Hollie Olivia Whitehead at Verité <hollie@veritedesigngroup.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, 17 December 2018 14:02  
**To:** MayorandCouncillors  
**Cc:** Hollie Olivia Whitehead  
**Subject:** comments for Public Hearing, Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaws 9965, 9966, 9967 and 9968

**Categories:** - TO: MAYOR & EACH COUNCILLOR / FROM: CITY CLERK'S OFFICE



REGARDING: Public Hearing Agenda Item for December 17, 2018

*Richmond Zoning Bylaw 8500, Amendment Bylaws 9965, 9966, 9967 and 9968*

Dear Mayor Brodie and Councillors,

I submit my comments as a residential designer who designs the blueprints for home in several municipalities, and as someone who had lived and worked in Richmond for many years.

Regarding proposed **Bylaw 9965** and **Bylaw 9968**: I urge NO CHANGE for the smaller AG-1 zoned lots and RS1 lots in the ALR.

Enacting a 400 sq.m. limit puts these lots at a crippling disadvantage. As I understand it, the intention here is to protect farmland. However, these proposed changes actually place these farmland owners at a substantial discrimination.

As one real-life example, a small (one-third acre) AG-1 lot I am working on for long-time Richmond taxpayers would suffer a loss of 2,680 square feet (249 sq.m.) compared with that exact lot if zoned as typical RS-1.

Why should AG-1 lots be penalized and RS-1 lots received significantly higher buildable square feet?

Under the proposed reduction, the exact lot zoned as AG-1 can only build 64% compared to being zoned as RS-1.

This proposed reduction to 400sq.m. is harmful in very real ways to real families and I urge you to dismiss this proposed reduction.

I support the earlier reductions in FAR but these new proposals go too far.

I also urge the City to refuse the amendment **Bylaw 9966 Part B**) regarding the height reduction. These properties are very often faced with irregular and difficult siting challenges and drainage issues and the 10.5m current Height allows for better problem solving and a service cavity for air-tightness which is becoming more critical with the newly introduced Energy Step Code. I recommend leaving the Height as is, at 10.5m

**Bylaw 9966 Part C**) regarding 60% for the home footprint is also problematic and should be refused. This proposal penalizes those who prefer an open skyline and choose a rancher style home. On the one hand the City is trying to limit heights, and yet, on the other, someone who chooses a low building is put at a disadvantage.

**Bylaw 9968** should be refused for the reasons noted earlier. It places these landowners at a disadvantage compared to urban landowners.

Thank you for considering these proposed 'broad brushstrokes' in relation to real-world situations and properties. These are real people and lands being impacted, not simply numbered lots on a paper zoning map.

Respectfully,  
Hollie Whitehead

---

Hollie Olivia Whitehead  
*Principal*  
Verité Design Group Inc.

**VERITÉ**

[hollie@veritedesigngroup.com](mailto:hollie@veritedesigngroup.com)  
Canada mobile +1 604 716-9112  
France +33 (0) 6 40 59 16 27

—